

HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, Utah
Airport Advisory Board Meeting
Wednesday, May 8, 2013

4:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

Members Present:	Nadim AbuHaidar	Airport Advisory Board
	Jeff Mabbutt	Airport Advisory Board
	Kari McFee	Airport Advisory Board
	Mel McQuarrie	Airport Advisory Board
	Erik Rowland	Airport Advisory Board
Absent:	Dave Hansen	Airport Advisory Board
	Tom Melville	Airport Advisory Board
Others:	Mark Anderson	City Manager
	Terry Loboschefskey	Airport Manager
	Karen Tozier	Airport Advisory Board Secretary

Others: Tom Meecham, Myra Strauchen, Paul Boyer, Craig Sparks, Morgan Einspahr, and Kirk Nielsen.

Chairman Rowland convened the meeting at 4:05 p.m. with a quorum present. The meeting had been moved to the City Council Chambers as there were a number of people in attendance. Bentley Ackerson's presence was acknowledged; he was from Boy Scout Troup 1052.

Item 1 **Airport Manager Report**

Terry Loboschefskey presented his report.

Regarding the runway and apron project, Mark Anderson indicated that in talking with Armstrong Engineers it appears that one of the ways they are keeping people in towers has been to steal some money out of the AIP Projects from the FAA. So this may affect timing on grants and could affect the ability to have this project come off as expected time wise.

Chairman Rowland asked questions about helicopter training ops which Terry Loboschefskey and Boardmember AbuHaidar answered. Boardmember AbuHaidar thought there could be discussion from the Rules and Regulations on ultralights and skydiving at the next Board meeting relating to traffic patterns. Boardmember AbuHaidar noted that the Rules and Regulations said that ultralights /skydiving needed to have approval by Terry Loboschefskey to conduct their activities. Terry Loboschefskey indicated he thought this was not necessarily true because these activities are regulated by the FAA. The Board was to look at this. Anderson indicated there is a petitioner who wants to start a skydiving operation at the airport. This would need to meet minimum standards and they would have to have acceptable locations for jumps so

there may be a proposal to locate an operation of this nature on the field. Questions on what conditions do we put on this type of operation to make sure it is safe. Chairman Rowland asked to discuss this next month. Terry Loboschefskey was tasked with looking at the Rules and Regulations and reporting on this.

A question on glider trailer placement was asked by a member of the public, Tom Meecham. Terry Loboschefskey is to direct the users where to place the glider trailers. It is possible that there will be future discussion on whether the City will charge fees to allow users to store the trailers on the field. Discussion on fees. Boardmember McQuarrie commented that he thought something needed to be charged. Currently \$20.00 is charged to park next to the FBO. The understanding of the Mr. Meecham was that the City would allow the glider trailers to be parked on the northeastern storage area for free; although he indicated that this would be up to the City. The northern area is farther away from the area the gliders take off from. Discussion on departure area and traffic flow safety.

Boardmember AbuHaidar thought this should be tabled until Dave Robinson of Soar Utah could comment on this. Chairman Rowland indicated this would have to go to City Council for a decision. Boardmember Mabbutt expressed his thoughts were that the City should be compensated for using the northern area and explained why he thought this; which was for reasons of maintenance mainly.

Item 2 **Kirk Nielsen – Jviation – Discuss Scope of Work/Schedule for Hangar Leasing Policies Project**

Chairman Rowland introduced this item and explained the two items identified in the scope of work that were identified in the RFP, which were:

- 1 Identify conditions where the City should consider granting extensions to existing reversionary and non-reversionary leases
- 2 Evaluate the current hangar lease agreement and make recommendations for modifications to existing lease rates for the purpose of developing a rates and charges document to maximize City/Hangar owner benefit in light of the current market

Boardmember AbuHaidar explained what he had discussed at the prior meeting which was for the scope of work for this project to include an outline for a policy document; a document that explains how you apply for a lease, how you assess the rates, review rates, and what process the City would go through to establish fair market value rates.

Kirk Nielsen of Jviation began the presentation by introducing his colleagues; this was to make sure they were all on the same page as far as the scope of work. Morgan Einspahr who does Planning and Outreach Support for Jviation explained the four key items of the project; the goals of the project, the scope of work (the way they have it now and what changes the City might want to put into it), the schedule, and the final deliverables. To start the project out they want to develop a survey to distribute to airports similar in size and nature to the Heber City Airport. The general list of questions that might be put on that survey might be about lease type, reversionary/non-reversionary and the duration of the leases and escalation clauses, hangar ownership and rates. Mark Anderson indicated that he was not sure the tiedown fees and the special facilities fees were necessary. Boardmember Mabbutt thought perhaps the questions on special facilities fees should be left on the survey; perhaps by leaving these questions on the

survey they might find some things that other airports are doing that we might want to look at. Chairman Rowland commented on having a question on whether the airport should make available more public use tiedowns outside of those the FBO has.

A list was shown of airports similar to Heber City's. Kirk Nielsen explained why they had added St. George; with all the new hangars St. George has gone through brand new leasing structures, etc. this maybe something comparable to what Heber City would like to go through. Discussion on other airports that might be similar. Tom Meecham indicated he thought Morgan County might be comparable. Hailey, Idaho was mentioned. Craig Sparks noted you would be looking at leasing standards. Discussion on the lease rates and leases policy; could it be done and how it would affect the study? Boardmember AbuHaidar explained why he thought the rates and leases policy was important and the background for this reasoning. Sparks indicated they could see whether airports would share their leasing documents and get samples to review. Boardmember AbuHaidar expressed that he thought they would only understand the data knowing what the policies would be.

Chairman Rowland asked in response to the study, how does this affect the lease policy? Kirk Nielsen indicated they need to assess the impact and he would get back to the City on this. Boardmember McQuarrie commented on the reversionary/non-reversionary issue; he thought we need an expert opinion in what the other airports are doing so we can compare. Boardmember Mabbutt asked what the results are regarding airports that have got the reversionaries back after a period of time such as two years.

Craig Sparks spoke about the list they had come up with of similar airports. He indicated that if there were thoughts on other comparable airports that they let them know; these could also be looked at. The Board discussed at length the scope of the study, data, growth at the Airport and the asset of the Airport further. Boardmember McQuarrie expressed he was not sure the Board had tasked them with the correct thing. There was lengthy debate on the scope of work. One comment was that there be an understanding of the value of what is fair in respect to what is here.

Morgan Einspahr indicated she thought maybe the team from Jviation needed to discuss this a bit and then do an updated scope of work with their ideas of what the City wants. Sparks thought they should add that Jviation would collect data and then come back to the City in a session to present some of that data and then out of that define the direction in which they are headed. Further discussion and then Craig Sparks commented that the City did not hire them to look at long term planning. Kirk Nielsen discussed probable FAA responses to requests for funding. There was a decision to schedule Jviation to report at the next meeting.

Item 3 **Review of Proposed Terminal Area Development Plan Drawings**

The Board reviewed the final drawing from Justin Pietz. Chairman Rowland asked if anyone could see anything they had discussed that had been missed. Anderson indicated this needed to be sent to the FAA for their comments. The drawing was looked at closely and past changes the Board had asked for were noted.

Boardmember McFee motioned to okay it as these new improvements have been made. Boardmember AbuHaidar seconded the motion. Voting Aye: Boardmembers McFee, Rowland, Mabbutt, AbuHaidar, and McQuarrie. Voting Nay: none. The motion passed.

Item 4 **Review Draft Design Guidelines for Future Hangar Development**

Anderson noted some amendments to be made; correcting some typographical errors and inserting City Council instead of Heber City Planning and Zoning Dept. as the Council ought to be the ultimate approving authority. The building department also had some changes relating to International Building Codes.

Boardmember McQuarrie commented on Section A-3.1 on Page 6; “When satisfied that all provisions of this directive had been...” to replace the word ‘all’ with ‘applicable’. There was discussion on whether a block building would be permitted. Under A-2.3 Framing it states that all framing shall be of metal. This brought up the question of whether internal framing had to be of metal also, or could wood framing be used on the interior of a hangar? Fire and occupancy standards were discussed in relation to this. There was discussion on color specifications / architectural standards. There appeared to be consensus that the architectural standards should be a separate document. Discussion also on the importance of maintaining consistency particularly if it is determined that there will be more than one developer. Consensus between Boardmembers to continue this and fine tune the document and architectural standards and colors need to be addressed wherever it is determined they make the most sense.

Boardmember McQuarrie motioned to continue, not to table. Boardmember AbuHaidar seconded the motion. Chairman Rowland stated that we have a motion to continue the discussion on the draft design guidelines for future hangar development to include the architectural design standards and we have a motion that was made by Mel and a second by Nadim, any other discussion. There was none. Voting Aye: Boardmembers McFee, Rowland, Mabbutt, AbuHaidar, and McQuarrie. Voting Nay: none. The motion passed.

Other Items as Needed

There were no other items.

Boardmember McQuarrie motioned to adjourn the meeting. Boardmember AbuHaidar seconded the motion. Voting Aye: Boardmembers McFee, Rowland, Mabbutt, AbuHaidar, and McQuarrie. Voting Nay: none. The motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 5:46 p.m.